1	FILED
2	LODGED —— ENTERED —— RECEIVED
3	
4	WESTERN DISTRICT COLIDT
5	UEPUTY WASHINGTON DEPUTY
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7	AT SEATTLE
8	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, NO. (1 K 04-124 P
9	Plaintiff,
10	v. PLEA AGREEMENT
11	LESLIE KILLINGSWORTH,
12	Defendant.
13	
14	The United States of America, by and through John McKay, United States
15	Attorney for the Western District of Washington, Kurt P. Hermanns and Floyd G. Short,
16	Assistant United States Attorneys for said District, and the Defendant, LESLIE
17	KILLINGSWORTH, and his attorney, Kevin J. Curtis, enter into the following
18	Agreement, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c):
19	1. Waiver of Indictment. Defendant, having been advised of the right to be
20	charged by Indictment, agrees to waive that right and enter a plea of guilty to the
21	charge brought by the United States Attorney in an Information.
22	2. <u>The Charge</u> . Defendant, having been advised of the right to have this
23	matter tried before a jury, agrees to waive that right and enter a plea of guilty to the
24	following charge contained in the Information. By entering this plea of guilty, Defendant
25	hereby waives all objections to the form of the charging document.
26	a. Wire Fraud, as charged in Count 1, in violation of Title 18, United
27	States Code. Sections 1343 and 1346.

3. <u>Elements of the Offense</u>. The elements of the offense of wire fraud, as charged in Count 1, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 and 1346, are as follows:

First, that the defendant knowingly created or participated in a scheme and artifice to defraud, to deprive another of the right of honest services, and to obtain money by false pretenses and representations as alleged in the Information;

Second, the defendant knew that the pretenses or representations were false and fraudulent;

Third, the false and fraudulent pretenses or representations concerned a material matter;

Fourth, the defendant acted with the intent to defraud and to deprive of the right of honest service; and

Fifth, the defendant used, or caused the use of wire communications in interstate commerce to carry out, or attempt to carry out the scheme.

- 4. <u>The Penalties</u>. Defendant understands that the statutory penalties for the offense of wire fraud, as charged in Count 1, are as follows:
- a. <u>Count 1 (Wire Fraud)</u>: imprisonment for up to five (5) years, a fine of up to two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000), a period of supervision following release from prison of at least two years but not more than three years, and a one hundred dollar (\$100.00) penalty assessment. The defendant agrees that the penalty assessment shall be paid at or before the time of sentencing.

Defendant agrees that any monetary penalty the Court imposes, including the special assessment, fine, costs or restitution, is due and payable immediately, and further agrees to submit a completed Financial Statement of Debtor form as requested by the United States Attorney's Office.

Defendant understands that supervised release is a period of time following imprisonment during which he will be subject to certain restrictions and requirements.

Defendant further understands that if supervised release is imposed and he violates one or

Guidelines range up to the maximum term authorized by law;

- d. The Court is not bound by any recommendation regarding the sentence to be imposed, or by any calculation or estimation of the Sentencing Guidelines range offered by the parties, or by the United States Probation Department; and
- e. Defendant may not withdraw a guilty plea solely because of the sentence imposed by the Court.
- 7. <u>Ultimate Sentence</u>. Defendant acknowledges that no one has promised or guaranteed what sentence the Court will impose.
- 8. <u>Loss Amount</u>. The United States and the defendant agree that the correct amount of intended loss for purposes of USSG §§ 2B1.1 and 2F1.1 shall be \$902,497.
- 9. <u>Statement of Facts</u>. The parties agree on the following facts in support of Defendant's guilty plea and for purposes of calculating the base offense level of the Sentencing Guidelines. Defendant admits he is guilty of the charged offense.
- a. At all relevant times LESLIE KILLINGSWORTH was an employee and shareholder of Datum Pacific, Inc., with its headquarters in Coupeville, Washington. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH was a licensed Washington State Professional Engineer. In that capacity he also acted as the District Engineer on a variety of projects for the Holmes Harbor Sewer District (the "District"), a municipal corporation that provided sewer and water service on Whidbey Island, Washington.
- b. In approximately the fall of 1999, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH agreed to act as the District's Engineer for a development project proposed by Terry Martin. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH had a fiduciary duty to protect the District in connection with Mr. Martin's actions and representations. In particular, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH was to advise the District of the functionality of the infrastructure for the project, its progress, and to approve all payments made to Mr. Martin. Mr. Martin's plan envisioned the issuance by the District of about \$20 million in tax exempt municipal bonds to fund the construction of infrastructure and utilities, and to purchase 15 acres of land relating to a privately funded office complex called the Silver Sound Corporate Center. The project

5

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15 16

17 18

20

21

19

22 23

25

24

26 27

28

was located near Paine Field in Everett, Washington. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH understood that assessments levied against owners or users of the Corporate Center would be the source of revenue for repayment of the municipal bonds.

- Between approximately May 2000 and October 2000, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH was aware that Mr. Martin's site plan application with the City of Everett had not been accepted and was returned as incomplete. He knew further that the City had issued a list of necessary corrections to be addressed before the application would again be accepted. Mr. Martin directed Mr. KILLINGSWORTH to not disclose the city's return of the application to the District or to the bond counsel and the bond underwriters. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH did not do so. Withholding such information was a material omission and a violation of his duty to protect the District.
- Between about March 19, 2000 and October 20, 2000, in his capacity d. as District Engineer, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH submitted letters to the District, which he understood would be forwarded to bond counsel and the bond underwriters. Those letters were misleading and deceptive in several respects. The letters failed to disclose that the site plan had not been accepted, was returned as incomplete, and required additional information. The letters falsely implied that certain work done by a prior owner, such as zoning, a school study and a regional environmental impact study performed for the City of Everett, were tasks performed by Mr. Martin. In a letter dated October 19, 2000, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH represented that the clearing and grading permits would be issued in about two weeks. Those various statements were misleading, deceptive and false. Mr. Martin directed Mr. KILLINGSWORTH to include the statements in the letters. Each of the letters, although signed and ostensibly issued by Mr. KILLINGSWORTH, were in fact written in part, edited and approved by Mr. Martin.
- e. In approximately August 2000, before the bond issuance, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH, others at Datum Pacific, and Mr. Martin agreed that Mr. Martin would purchase Datum Pacific for approximately \$2 million. These discussions began in approximately 1998 and should have been disclosed to the District by Mr. Killingsworth.

1	f. At the time of closing of the municipal bond issuance on or about
2	October 26, 2000, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH learned that Mr. Martin had requested a draw
3	of about \$1.24 million from bond proceeds to one of his companies called Silver Legacy.
4	Mr. KILLINGSWORTH knew and understood that such pay requests were to be limited
5	to reimbursement for work already performed on the public infrastructure portion of the
6	project. In reviewing Mr. Martin's documentation for the pay request it was apparent to
7	Mr. KILLINGSWORTH that not all of the work had in fact been performed.
8	Nevertheless, at Mr. Martin's insistence and direction, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH approved
9	and certified the pay request. Mr. Martin and Silver Legacy were thereafter paid the
10	funds by the District.
11	g. In early November 2000, after closing of the bond issuance, Mr.
12	KILLINGSWORTH learned that the site plan application still had not been resubmitted to

- Mr. KILLINGSWORTH learned that the site plan application still had not been resubmitted to the city of Everett and that Mr. Martin had not applied for permits. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH understood that immediate commencement of construction was an important element of the municipal bond issuance. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH did not make that disclosure to the District knowing that it was a material omission. Mr. Martin had previously directed Mr. Killingsworth to not disclose the information and he treated that as a continuing directive.
- h. In approximately late November 2000, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH, working with Mr. Martin and others, assembled another pay request, called Pay Request No. 3. It was for approximately \$902,000 to be paid to Mr. Martin's company Silver Legacy from bond proceeds. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH knew and understood that this pay request was false and fraudulent in several material ways. First, previously issued Datum Pacific invoices relating to projects other than the Silver Sound Corporate Center, which Mr. Martin had not paid, were fraudulently rewritten to appear that they related to the Silver Sound Corporate Center project and thus were appropriately paid from municipal bond proceeds. Second, Datum Pacific invoices were fraudulently rewritten to change the scope of work, date of work and payment histories to make them appear that the work had

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	recently occurred on the Silver Sound project and justified a draw request. Third, an
2	invoice from another contractor, W. H. LLC, for about \$441,000, was false and
3	fraudulent in that it described work that had not been performed at all. Fourth, an invoice
4	from Silver Legacy in the amount of about \$277,000 was false in that no work had been
5	done since the prior pay request. Pay Request No. 3 and the false invoices were faxed, by
6	interstate wire communication, between Mr. KILLINGSWORTH and the underwriters in
7	California. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH signed and certified Pay Request No. 3. Mr.
8	KILLINGSWORTH participated in the fabrication of Pay Request No. 3 in an effort to
9	provide Mr. Martin sufficient funds to pay his debt to Datum Pacific.
10	i. At a meeting of the Board of Commissioners for the District on
11	December 7, 2000, Mr. KILLINGSWORTH and Mr. Martin submitted Pay Request No. 3
12	for payment. It was rejected because the Board of Commissioners had recently learned
13	that permits had not been issued and essentially no construction or mobilization work had
14	been done at the site.
15	j. On or about December 18, 2000, Mr. Martin directed Mr.
16	KILLINGSWORTH to contact the President of the Board of Commissioners for the
17	District to retrieve Pay Request No. 3 and the accompanying false invoices. Mr. Martin
18	stated the documents had to be retrieved. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH contacted the
19	chairman but was unable to retrieve the documents.
20	k. Mr. KILLINGSWORTH's actions were taken knowingly,
21	deliberately and with the intent to defraud.
22	1. The acts described herein occurred within the Western District of
23	Washington and elsewhere.
24	
25	10. Non-Prosecution of Additional Offenses. As part of this Plea Agreement,
26	the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington agrees not to
27	prosecute defendant for any additional offenses known to it as of the time of this

28 Agreement that are based upon evidence in its possession at this time, and that relate to

- 11. <u>Voluntariness of Plea</u>. Defendant acknowledges that he has entered into this Plea Agreement freely and voluntarily, and that no threats or promises, other than the promises contained in this Plea Agreement, were made to induce defendant to enter this plea of guilty.
- 12. Statute of Limitations. In the event that this Agreement is not accepted by the Court for any reason, or defendant has breached any of the terms of this Plea Agreement, the statute of limitations shall be deemed to have been tolled from the date of the Plea Agreement to: (1) 30 days following the date of non-acceptance of the Plea Agreement by the Court; or (2) 30 days following the date on which a breach of the Plea Agreement by defendant is discovered by the United States Attorney's Office.
- Agreement apply only to conduct that occurred prior to the execution of this Agreement. If, after the date of this Agreement, defendant should engage in conduct that would warrant an increase in defendant's adjusted offense level or justify an upward departure under the Sentencing Guidelines (examples of which include, but are not limited to: obstruction of justice, failure to appear for a court proceeding, criminal conduct while pending sentencing, and false statements to law enforcement agents, the probation officer or Court), the United States is free under this Agreement to seek a sentencing enhancement or upward departure based on that conduct.
- 14. <u>Cooperation</u>. Defendant shall cooperate completely and truthfully with law enforcement authorities in the investigation and prosecution of other individuals involved

11 12

13

15

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28

PLEA AGREEMENT - Page 9

(KILLINGSWORTH/

in criminal activity. Such cooperation shall include, but not be limited to, complete and truthful statements to law enforcement officers, as well as complete and truthful testimony, if called as a witness before a grand jury, or at any state or federal trial, retrial, or other judicial proceedings. Defendant acknowledges that this obligation to cooperate shall continue after Defendant has entered a guilty plea and sentence has been imposed, no matter what sentence Defendant receives; Defendant's failure to do so may constitute a breach of this Plea Agreement.

Defendant understands that the United States will tolerate no deception from him. If, in the estimation of the United States Attorney, information or testimony provided from the date of the Plea Agreement, proves to be untruthful or incomplete in any way, regardless of whether the untruthfulness helps or hurts the United States' case, the United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington may consider that Defendant has breached this Plea Agreement.

The United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington, in turn, agrees not to prosecute Defendant for any other offenses, other than crimes of violence, that Defendant may have committed in the Western District of Washington prior to the date of this Agreement about which: (1) the United States presently possesses information; or (2) Defendant provides information pursuant to this Agreement to cooperate with the authorities.

The parties agree that information provided by Defendant in connection with this Plea Agreement shall not be used to determine Defendant's sentence, except to the extent permitted by USSG § 1B1.8.

In exchange for Defendant's cooperation, as described above, and conditioned upon Defendant's fulfillment of all conditions of this Plea Agreement, the United States Attorney agrees to consider filing a motion, pursuant to USSG § 5K1.1 permitting the Court to sentence Defendant to less than the otherwise applicable Sentencing Guideline range and below the mandatory minimum sentence.

Defendant agrees that his sentencing date may be delayed based on the United

27

28